

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 24 to 57 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 44 stands object to. Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claim 1 stands rejected for double patenting—same invention. Claims 1 and 24 to 57 stand rejected for obviousness-type double patenting.

Applicants have amended Claim 44 to correct the typographical error noted by the Examiner in the objection to Claim 44. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to Claim 44.

Claim 43 is amended to correct a typographic informality.

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The rejection stated in part:

. . . The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one of skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The limitation "a small footprint device" is not supported in the specification.

Applicants respectfully traverse the § 112, first paragraph enablement rejection of Claim 31. Applicants respectfully note that the specification describes at least one embodiment of a small footprint device, a smartcard, and goes into some detail on how to make and/or use the invention on such a small footprint device. In view of this description those of skill in the art would understand how to make and to use the invention on small footprint devices.

In addition, the specification specifically established an equivalence between a smartcard and other small footprint devices.

This is especially a problem when the VM is intended to operate within a small, low-cost, portable, yet

security-sensitive product, such as a smart card, electronic wallet or other consumer product possibly involved in electronic money transactions.

Specification, Pg. 3, lines 5 to 8. Thus, the specification describes a smart card as one example of a small, low-cost, portable, yet security-sensitive product, i.e., a small footprint device. Therefore, the teachings with respect to a smart card extend to other devices in the family.

Accordingly, when the specification is read as a whole and Claim 31 is interpreted in view of that specification, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 31 satisfies the requirements of § 112, first paragraph. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection of Claim 31.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,147. Applicants have cancelled Claim 1 and so rendered this rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §101 double patenting-same invention rejection.

Claims 24 to 57 stand rejected for nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting in view of Claims 1 to 42 of U.S. Patent No. 6,640,279.

Enclosed herewith is a terminal disclaimer and the appropriate fee. Thus, the nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting in view of Claims 1 to 42 of U.S. Patent No. 6,640,279 of Claim 24 to 57 has been overcome. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting in view of Claims 1 to 42 of U.S. Patent No. 6,640,279.

Claims 24 to 57 stand rejected for nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting in view of Claims 1 to 23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,147.

Enclosed herewith is a terminal disclaimer and the appropriate fee. Thus, the nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting in view of Claims 1 to 23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,147 of Claim 24 to 57 has been overcome. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting in view of Claims 1 to 23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,147.

Claims 24 to 57 remain in the application. Claims 43 and 44 have been amended. Claim 1 was canceled. Claims 2 to 23 were cancelled previously. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 13, 2007.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

July 13, 2007
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899
Tel.: (831) 655-0880